

President, the U.S. increased its spending on food stamps by more than \$19 billion. That's a "b." The source? The U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Here's fact number two. Under the food stamp President, the number of people using the food stamp program increased by 11 million people. The source? The USDA.

Here's fact number three. Even the amount of the benefit has increased under the food stamp President. The amount per benefit increased \$27.38 per recipient. Not much you would say, \$27. Guess what? The \$27 increase per benefit is the largest increase that's occurred under any President in the last 30 years. Pretty dramatic, huh? What's the source of that? The USDA.

Now, let's just review for everybody again. Republicans and Democrats, let's all get together and review that the numbers don't lie. Under the Food Stamp President, spending increased by more than \$19 billion; the number of people using the program increased by 11 million people; and the amount of the benefit increased by a historic amount not seen in the last 30 years.

We may not like the facts, but sometimes the truth just hurts.

Here we have him, the food stamp President of the United States. Yes, George W. Bush is the Food Stamp President of the United States. Under the food stamp President, George Bush, we spent more, had more recipients, and gave each recipient more money for food.

Now, I know that some of you are saying, LUIS, you aren't being fair. Aren't there some other food stamp Presidents out there? Okay. You're right.

Yet, under another food stamp President, spending increased by more than \$9 billion, the number of recipients increased by 7 million, and the amount of the benefit increased by \$17. Yes, it's showing who it is. Here it is. George Herbert Walker Bush was also the food stamp President. See, it runs in the family. Food stamp President, senior, and food stamp President, junior. It's hereditary. A rampant family disease that makes them just want to feed hungry poor people.

Now, I have to confess and make a confession today. I support the food stamp program. I think that SNAP—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, to call it by its actual name and not something that Newt Gingrich thinks is politically punchy—serves an important purpose. The purpose is largely to prevent children and old people from going hungry. SNAP doesn't provide them with some fancy perk from some out-of-control free spending program. It provides kids and old people with food. You can't redeem food stamps at Tiffany, which might be another reason why Newt Gingrich thinks it's so bad.

But I think that Americans want their people not to go hungry. Just in case I'm wrong, if Newt Gingrich met a food stamp President other than the

one named George Bush, I want to thank Barack Obama today because he's also invested in SNAP. He's invested in nutrition for America's most vulnerable.

Here's another fact, the last one I'll make today, Mr. Speaker, and this one is for Newt Gingrich. Just in case his food stamp President name-calling was designed to make a political point that he wasn't quite so willing to come right out and say of the recipients whose race we know, 22 percent of SNAP recipients are black, 34 percent are white, because hunger knows no race or religion or age or political party. Hunger is color-blind, Mr. Gingrich.

#### REGULATIONS PREVENT JOBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago during a district work period, I had the privilege to catch up with many of my constituents back in Michigan's Seventh District.

Business owners graciously invited me into their facilities eager to talk about the economic climate as well as what can be done to promote growth. These conversations continued in coffeehouses and town halls across the district where citizens packed into rooms eager to exchange their ideas, triumphs, and concerns with me.

But whether I was being given a tour by the owner of a manufacturing plant or having a cup of coffee with an engineer, a similar theme kept cropping up: People are worried about excessive, Big Government regulations, in particular how they impose unreasonable costs on businesses, create uncertainty and, in turn, affect job growth.

This time, many of my constituents expressed outrage over a new youth agricultural labor rule program. The Department of Labor proposed regulations to restrict the types of activities young people can participate in. While the rule includes an exemption of children on nonincorporated farms owned by their parents, it could prevent kids from working on incorporated farms owned by their parents, grandparents, aunts, and uncles, and close neighbors.

Even on such extended family farms, children under the age of 16 may be banned from working with animals or in specified farm situations while those under the age of 18 would be prohibited from any job "involving farm product raw materials." That could come to mean any job involving grain elevators, grain bins, silos, feed lots, stockyards, livestock exchanges, and livestock auctions. If carried any further, the rule may end up barring kids from selling animals at their local 4-H fairs. This is nanny statism to the absurd.

My kids were all in 4-H, and some of the best memories we have together are these events. It was always a positive experience for my sons and daugh-

ter as well as every other child I know who got involved. Besides the life lessons learned—responsibility, hard work, and self-sufficiency—children often use the money from the sale of their animals for their college funds. This rule would not only hurt their ability to find a job now but also hurt their future.

In addition to participating in 4-H fairs, my kids also worked on farms where they were asked to drive tractors and run other farm machinery, all under the age of 16. The worst mishaps one of my kids ever had was running over a neighbor's mailbox with his duallies. But even through that experience, he learned responsibility. He not only had to pay for a new one out of his own pocket, but to replace it himself.

Farmers depend upon young people to take on these extra jobs so they can focus on the bigger picture. Parents depend upon their children to work on the family farm, not only to help out but instill a love of farming at a young age to keep their family farm going.

Lastly, young people, themselves, depend on these jobs as a source of income and a way to pay for college. There are often fewer job opportunities in rural areas, and if we impose more rules about what jobs young people can take, what have we gained?

I'll always stand behind regulations that genuinely protect the workers, especially when those workers are children. But when government bureaucrats are regulating in what capacity a young person can work on a farm, then it's clear they've overstepped their boundaries. It's time to fix the flawed and broken regulatory system that allows such rules to slip through the cracks.

Mr. Speaker, related, it's also the time to push back on Big Government's attack on our freedom to choose and our constitutional liberties. The recent assault on our religious rights of conscience and the separation of powers by this administration must be defeated. Kids on the farm and in the city deserve the rich future that our Constitution and Americans' exceptionalism can provide. This will then be a Nation that God can truly continue to bless.

□ 1040

#### CONGRATULATING THE CITY OF INDIANAPOLIS AS HOST OF SUPER BOWL XLVI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the great city of Indianapolis, my hometown, for doing an outstanding job as the host of Super Bowl XLVI.

On Sunday, two teams played an incredible game; but I believe that the events leading up to kickoff, organized by countless community organizations, good corporate citizens, committed public leaders, and thousands of volunteers, were as impressive as any play